

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview with Applicants' representatives at the United States Patent and Trademark office on November 10, 2005 during which the issues raised in an outstanding final Office Action in the above-referenced patent application were discussed. In view of those discussions, Applicants amend the claims as indicated above. Support for the amendments can be found, e.g., on pages 5-8, in the original claims and throughout the remainder of the specification. The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejects claims 40-89 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,884,032 of Bateman.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of establishing a communications call that includes enabling an A party to select a B party from *a database of a messaging network* using an interactive device connected to a public network, which comprises the messaging network. The messaging network is utilized to access the called address data for the B party from a public directory of the public network in response to selecting the B party. The called address data for the B party and calling address data for the A party are sent to a connection module of the public network; and a call is established between the A and B parties over the public network by employing the connection module and the called and calling address data.

Bateman discloses a call center that allows a customer to utilize equipment present on its premises (e.g., a computer and a telephone) to submit a help call request to the center, and to receive, in response, a call back from an agent working at the call center. The customer, however, does not select the call center from *a database of a messaging network*. Moreover, as noted in the response to the previous Office Action, in Bateman, the customer does not choose a particular agent (i.e., a B party).

Hence, claim 40 distinguishes patentably over Bateman.

Similar arguments apply to establish that the remaining claims are also patentable over Bateman. For example, independent claims 41, 45, 46 are likewise amended to recite “enabling an A party to select a B party from *a database of a messaging network*,” and claim 50 now recites “a display controller for causing display of at least one B party from *a database of messaging network*.” And claim 51 recites “a search generator for generating a search of *a messaging network database* for a B party upon request from an A party using a public directory of a public network comprising said messaging network.” Other independent claims are also amended in a similar fashion, as indicated above.

Accordingly, claims 40-89 distinguish patentably over Bateman.

In Paragraph 4, the Office Action rejects claims 40-41, 45-46, 50-51, 56-57, 60-61, 69-70, 73 and 77 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4, 979,206 of Padden.

Padden is generally directed to a system for automatically obtaining directory assistance, which connects a customer requesting directory assistance to an automatic speech recognition unit (ASRU), and prompts the customer to identify a requested directory number. The ASRU converts the customer’s speech signals to data signals for searching a directory. If the search identifies the desired number, it is sent to the customer, and the customer is prompted to indicate whether a call to the identified number should be made.

Unlike amended claim 40, in Padden’s system, the customer is not enabled to select a party for which a directory number is desired from *a database of a messaging network*. Rather, the customer utilizes a speech recognition unit of the system to identify a desired directory number.

Hence, claim 40 is patentable over Padden. Similar arguments establish that the independent claims 41, 45, 46, 50, 51, 56, 57, 60, 61, 69, 70, 73 and 77 also distinguish patentably over Padden.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

Dated: Nov. 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Reza Mollaaghababa

Registration No.: 43,810

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP

World Trade Center West

155 Seaport Boulevard

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604

(617) 439-2514

(617) 310-9514 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

1481496.1